

COBBETT'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

Vol. 39.—No. 12.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1821. [Price 6d.

Published every Saturday Morning, at Six o'Clock.

TO
MR. CURWEN.

On the Husbandry-horse Tax.—

*On Salaries.—On Mr. Muschett
and the Fund-lords.—On Sir
Pompous Jolterhead's probable
fate.*

Kensington, 19. June, 1821.

SIR,

We have, at last, your Bill before us, for the repeal of the husbandry-horse tax, which bill, if it be carried, will take from the **THING** (for I never knew what name to give it) about *half a million* a year. I propose, with your leave, to make some remarks upon the debate, which took place in "the *Grand Council of the Nation*," upon the motion to bring in this bill; for, though the measure itself would be useful, the discussion of it, if well conducted, and if made to embrace matter with which it is ultimately connected, will be of much greater use than the measure itself.

I shall insert every thing material in the debate at the end of this letter; for it contains matter

very well worthy of our best attention, and particularly when viewed in conjunction with what has been, by Sir EDWARD KNATCHBULL and others, said about *Salaries*, and with the extraordinary efforts that the *Fund-lords* are now making against poor Sir POMPOUS JOLTERHEAD, backed as the *Fund-lords* are by Mr. MUSCHETT and by that great long-eared tooter, the *Times Newspaper*, at once the tutor and caterer of all the fools that inhabit these Islands.

In some parts the speech by which you introduced this measure was good enough. Your declining to propose any *substitute* for the tax was right, and was founded in sufficient reason. You were right also in saying, that this was only a *small beginning* in this way; that if the *Ministers* could not bring the increase up to the expenditure, they *must bring down the latter to the former*; that all must come down, *from the king to the lowest officer in the state*. But when you got into distinctions between *light soils* and *heavy soils*, your speech smelt of the earth. When so

2 L

Printed by C. CLEMENT, and published by JOHN M. COBBETT, 1, Clement's Inn.
[Price Sixpence Halfpenny in the Country.]

you talked about a *tax on the plough*; when you talked about the necessity of *new enclosures*; and especially when you talked about this tax weighing *heavier* upon the farmer than the *malt-tax*; when you got into these things you floundered and beat about sadly. Let me, therefore, endeavour to *steady* you a little; for, though you are "a curious sort of a man," you have good stuff in you. You say good things; but, then, there are bad ones that come out with them. My wish is, that we may continue to have all the good things and none of the bad ones.

Now, Sir, as to *soils*, how can this tax affect light soils more than heavy ones? You will say, perhaps, that *light* soils require, in proportion to the amount of their produce, more horses than *heavy* ones. Perhaps the epithets *light* and *heavy*, ought to be *poor* and *rich*; for, you are not to be told, that the *very heaviest* are the *very worst*. Taking you, then, to mean *poor* when you say *light*, it is an undoubted fact, that poor land, in proportion to the amount of its produce, requires more horses than rich land; in other words, that the new-enclosed land on *Bagshot heaths* require, for the same number of crops, as many

horses as the land at *Fulham*, the former not being worth half a crown an acre a year, and the latter being worth from ten to twenty pounds. But, because this fact is undoubted, it does not follow that the husbandman, or the landlord, of Bagshot suffers more acutely from the horse-tax than those of Fulham do. For, before a man goes to farming at Bagshot he takes *all out-goings in'o consideration*; and he certainly does not *forget* the article of *horses*! Therefore, *when he makes his bargain*, he reserves all that is required for horses, and just the same way that he makes reservation for *tithes*. He has the *rent* in one eye, and the *horses* in the other; and the extra cost on account of horses over the cost of rich land, he withholds from *rent*. As to the *landlord*, if he have purchased since the tax was laid on, he cannot complain; because, he knew the *rent*, and his purchase-money was in an exact proportion to that. If he *inherit* the lands, indeed, from distant descent, or possessed them *before the tax was laid on*, the tax operates partially against the owner of poor land; because it takes a greater proportion of his rent than of the rent of the owner of rich land.

The consumer pays, in the end, endeavour to assimilate animate to this as well as all other taxes; inanimate beings. No wonder but, then, the tax must operate that those who consider men as equally. If my neighbour and I machines, could consider horses make soap of the same quality; as implements. But, after all, if we both sell (as we must) at the same price, and if I pay a tax of 2d. a pound while he pays a tax of only 1d., it is clear that the tax bears heavier upon me than upon him, and that I myself, and not the consumer, pays the 1d. a pound on the soap. However, observe, it is the landlord, and not the farmer, that suffers in this case; only "for more grace," I suppose, the fashion of the day is, to put the howl into the mouth of the farmer. Stop a bit! I shall see you less coy. I shall hear you speak out, and put your own cases forward.

With regard to this tax being a "tax on the plough." Why not call it a tax on the harrow? A tax on the roller? A tax on the Dray - Cart? And Mr BROUGHAM, too, that hero of Westmoreland, he must object to the tax, not because it, like all other taxes, produced misery; but, because it was "a tax on the implements of agriculture." I never knew a Scotch Feelosofer the turn of whose mind it was not to make clear things dark, and who did not, whenever he could,

that those who consider men as machines, could consider horses as implements. But, after all, suppose it to be a tax on implements, is it more so than tithes, land-tax, and all other taxes paid by those that use implements? I disapprove of the tax, as I do all the taxes exceeding about seven millions a year; but I equally disapprove of this being attacked on false and foolish grounds, which, besides their intrinsic demerit, do harm to the cause of reduction; for, such grounds are easily exposed, and they viciate the thing in support of which they are brought forward.

The enclosure of more "waste" lands I never expected to hear proposed as a good to the country after the publication of my Letter to Mr. COKE. The enclosure of "wastes" increase employment! How? When a farmer does not employ men now, is it for want of land? Is it because he has his land as clean, as well fenced, as well-drained, and as rich as it can be? Oh, no! It is because he has not the means of payment. And, would he, then, have the means to break up and fence new lands? Madness! The "wastes" allotted,

indeed, to the *Fund-lords*, in order to pay them off, in order to cry *quits* with them; *that* would be the plan! And, even that would not cause them to be enclosed, unless a portion of the labourers were made their *slaves at once*. Nay, that would not effect so preposterous, so unnatural, an end.

But, Sir, how could you say, that the repeal of this tax would be a greater relief to agriculture than that of the *malt-tax*? If we grant, that taxes, when equally laid, bear upon the whole of the community (except the tax-eaters) in proportion to the consumption of each individual, *two millions* taken off must certainly afford more relief than half a million taken off. But, in the case of the malt-tax, this is the least part of the effect; for, take the tax off the malt, and you *add enormously to the consumption of the article*. There are five or six millions of people, at this moment, whose bodies are blown out with water, and whose bodies would be blown out with beer, if that tax were taken off. About 30,000,000 of bushels of barley would be required, perhaps; more than are now required, and the amount of which, drawn up in taxes, go to purchase wine and

other luxuries for the drones. Your bill to remove the horse-tax is *good*; but, let not your over-fondness for your own dear child, induce you to decry or disparage a repeal of the malt-tax; for the malt-tax and the salt-tax are the two most wicked and mischievous things that the ingenuity of the Dutch fund-inventors ever fell upon. These two taxes make their attack directly upon the land and upon husbandry labour. They find their way to all the community, at last; but, they are a *bar to production* at their first step; they say, "you shall not increase in good things;" they bid the earth be steril, bid cattle be diseased, and bid man faint in the field. We had about *ten good hot days last summer*; and we read of men *actually dropping down dead* in the fields! What would such men do under a Long Island sun? Why, they would not drop down at all; but then they must have *American food* in their bodies. I have had several Englishmen in the fields there. I never saw them faint or flinch; but always saw them stand the heat as well Jonathan himself. Well and hearty and merry as larks in a hundred degrees of heat day after day and night after night; ploughing from sun-rise

to sun-set, when the turkeys were dragging their wings upon the ground and gaping as wide as if under the operation of cramming. Sweating like rashers of bacon: but, then, they had *something in them* to sweat out, which our poor fellows have not. If we, under Mr. BENNET'S *gallon-loaf and three pence* regimen, were to be visited with a Long Island summer, PARSON MALTHUS might give up his *check-population* scheme; for three fourths of the people would *die*.

I now proceed to the other persons who figured upon this occasion, beginning with GAFFER GOOCH, who seconded your motion. The Gaffer said, and very truly, that the Ministers "could not have more than a cat and her skin." Yes, yes; but, they have not got the *skin yet*. They *will*, if you do not fight as bravely as pussy would; but, they have not got it yet. The heroes of the "last shilling" and *last drop of blood* ought not to grumble to let the *skin* go; but, it is not come to that *yet*. The Gaffer said if we could not increase our means we must *diminish our expenditure*, and he thanked Mr. HUME for his laudable efforts, tending to this object: nay, he said he could *not meet his*

constituents without having made *this declaration!*

Oh, brave, Gaffer! Now, if I had been in Mr. COKE'S place, I would not have reminded the Gaffer of his having voted *against* Mr. HUME'S propositions. The temptation was, however, so strong, that I will not *swear* that I should have resisted it. The praise given to Mr. HUME was no more than his due. *His* is a very good way of *going to work*. It is *do*: it is not *talk*. There is *industry* wanted; and he has shown that he has it. He has had no *party* support. Your Broughams and Mackintoshes and Scar'etts and Abercrombies have kept aloof from him. Tierney has, once or twice, given him as much of the *cold blanket* as he has left to give. He has fought almost single-handed; but he has given the Brough system a shock even in its citadel. This is the way that I, years ago, advised a great constitution-talker to go to work. But this was *do*; and my blade never liked *do*. Indeed he, even while he asked people to elect him, said that he could "*do no good*." Instead of looking into the ways in which the public money was expended, he, sublime soul, was looking about, for years and years, "*to find a*

"public!" Mr. HUME's has been a contrary way of going to work. He, being a mere mortal, takes it for *granted* that there is a public!

I now come to the speech of Mr. BARING, who seems, upon this occasion, to have discovered a good deal of displeasure, at which I am by no means surprised. I observed in one of my letters to Mr. PEEL, that there was a class of persons, who wished for things to go on in this present way: that is to say, to keep things in such a way as to prevent the *paper-system from being destroyed*, and that Mr. BARING was one of these. Perpetual *Bullion payments; lowering the standard*; any thing but destroy the *paper-system*, which will inevitably take place, if a *reduction of the interest of the Fund-lords come*. Now, Sir, there are two ways of proceeding to this reduction: one, by an *act declaring the object*; and, the other, by *taking away the means of paying the interest*. This is the *political* course for the landlords. The other course would be *unwise*, and would assuredly fail; for the long-eared press would set up such a tooting, that poor Sir Pompous Jolterhead would be frightened out of his senses. Mr. BARING

sees, I dare say, that, if the landlords proceed in the way of *withholding*, they are safe against the tooting press. For, *withholding* means *repeal of taxes*; and what tooter will dare raise his hideous voice *against the taking off of taxes*. To propose to *reduce the interest of the debt* would call forth all the powers of the tooter. The tooter would *net* a hundred thousand pounds by this fine occasion for out-cry. The tooter is a Jew himself too. This cause, therefore, would never do for Sir Pompous Jolterhead. His way is to go on *taking off taxes*; and, to be sure to *say nothing* about reducing the interest of the Fund-lords! Not a word about that; but, on the contrary, insist, that the Fund-lords ought to be *obliged to him*. And, if the Fund-lords should *smoke* Sir Pompous, and reproach him with breach of *national faith*; then he ought to set up a louder cry than they, and drown their voices with his *whooping* and *hollering* for *public credit* and *national faith*.

All this, I take it, Mr. BARING clearly sees; and, therefore, he is by no means *merry* when he sees the landlords taking this course. He saw that the thing *must come to this, if Peel's Bill*

were persevered in; and, accordingly we saw him trying, in all manner of ways, to cause that bill to be rendered of no effect. I pray you to mark this. He saw, that, if Peel's Bill went into effect, there must be a fight between the landlords and the fund-lords; and he did not wish to see this. He knew, that perpetual bullion-payments, or a lowering of the standard, would "keep the gig up;" and, he saw that an open fight would destroy the paper-system. I agree with him perfectly as to his reasoning; and the only difference between us, is, I wish the paper-system, loan-jobbing, stock-jobbing, jew-boy-million-making to be blown to atoms, and he appears to wish to keep the system up; and, I dare say, he will think it fortunate that my wishes do not accord with his. That wise being, Mr. JAMES PERRY, said, some-time ago, that our finances could not be in better hands than those of Mr. ALEXANDER BARING and Mr. Pascoe Grenfell. They both, he tells us, voted against your bill! Brave hands indeed!

Upon the present occasion Mr. BARING made stout fight for the Fund-lords. He said that the House ought not to have voted the estimates. Ah! at the salaries!

That's good! And he animadverted upon the injustice of the arguments, "which tended to point out" (very sensitive!) "the necessity of seizing upon the security of the public creditor, in order to relieve the distresses of the country." Seizing! Why, Sir, your bill seizes upon nothing. You could, I dare say, see nothing to seize on. But, at any rate, your bill says not a word about seizure. On the contrary, its object, and its effect too, is to remove the danger of a seizure of the farmer's goods by the collectors of the horse-tax duty. He means the Sinking-Fund, which has, even "within doors," been called a humbug a hundred times; and, surely, one cannot do much harm in seizing hold of a humbug. I should like to see a man indicted for "STEALING A HUMBUG!" However you propose no seizure: your bill only withholds so much from the revenue. You do not ask the ministers to reduce the interest of the Debt, nor to stop the Sinking-Fund; you only propose to stop so much out of the sums usually collected by them. It is for them to lessen their expences; and, if they will not do it in any other way, than that of injuring "public credit" he

theirs the blame of "*breach of national faith!*" That is the way to work them and the Fund-lords! Always stand to "national faith."

Mr. BARING, doubtless from the best of motives, though from erroneous views, says, that the Fund-lords "*lent their money during a period of exigency.*"

Did they lend a *twentieth part* of what is now said to be *their due*?

However, more of this another time; and let me here suppose, for argument's sake, that they actually *did lend* the money for which they now draw interest.

What reason have they to complain of the repeal of this tax?

It neither takes away any part of their *interest*, nor causes the necessity of doing it. Mr. Baring

says, that it robs the Sinking Fund. What business has the

Fund-lord with that? The Sinking Fund, if not a mere humbug,

is the nation's. It is to pay off *principal*; or, it is so much

actually *given* to the Fund-lords

over and above even their pretended due. The "*security* of

"the public creditor," Mr. BARING! What! Does he want

double security? Must he have a mortgage on the land and a

money fund in hand too as security! What pawn-broker was

ever before heard of like this

Fund-lord! Moses forbade the

Israelites even to take interest at

all of one of their own nation.

He forbade them to sleep with

their neighbour's pledge under

their roof; and so delicate was he

upon this point, that he forbade

them, when they lent, to go into

the borrower's house for the

pledge, and commanded them to

wait *without the door* to have the

pledge brought to them. Your

modern Jews seem to have for-

gotten all this; and, though their

progenitors were permitted to take

interest of *the stranger*, and we

of this unhappy nation may, per-

haps, be deemed *strangers*; yet,

double pledges were, surely, never

heard of before!

Mr. BARING is alarmed, lest

we should not be *able to borrow*,

"in case of *another war* in

"Europe, or in the event of a

"*war with America.*" I hope

we *shall not*! I hope, that *loan-*

jobbers, *scrip-grinders*, *bonus-*

gorgers, *million-makers*, will

never be heard of more after this

thing shall have been demolished.

My hope, however, has, perhaps,

no better foundation than Mr.

Baring's fear; for, if the Debt

were swept away to-morrow, there

would be loan-jobbers ready to

lend *the very next day*, if the

nation were base enough to suffer the government to borrow. Look at *France* and *America*. Both have paid off with a *sponge*; and both have nice little growing mill-stones hung about their necks; and the latter, if she do not shake her mill-stone off, will, in a few years, be cut up into little states, hostile to each other, and formidable to nobody but themselves.

I dissent wholly from Mr. BARING'S doctrine, that it is "the *first* duty of the House to "look to the *expenditure*, and "then to *provide for it*." Its first duty is to *redress grievances*, to take care of the *liberty* and *property* of the people; and, its next, to grant money to the King for carrying on the government; and, the grants are, to be sure, to be *proportioned to the people's means of paying*; and not to the projects and demands of the Ministers. It is no part of the business of a House of Commons to *superintend* the expenditure. It is a body *unfit* for that in exactly the same degree that it is *fit* for the purposes just mentioned. But, at any rate, what need is there of between *fifty and sixty millions of taxes*? What is all this money wanted *for*? If we grant (which I do not) that the Fund-lords have a right to press

upon the nation for the full amount of their *interest*, what is wanted of all the rest?

LANDLORD.—How much do you want to carry on the affairs of the nation?

BUDGET.—Fifty or Sixty millions.

LANDLORD.—The deuce you do! Can't you do with less?

BUDGET.—Not a single farthing, by ———

LANDLORD.—Don't swear! But, let us see. What do you want it all *for*?

BUDGET.—Why, there are the Fund-lords; and, to pay them their *bare interest*, demands about 30 millions. And, you know, they lent you the money at your *own request*.

FUNDLORD. Aye, and in a period of *pressing exigency*.

BUDGET. And for your *benefit*.

FUNDLORD. Aye, and *without any selfish motive*.

BUDGET. And always upon "terms *highly advantageous* to "you."

FUNDLORD. Aye, and out of *pure love* to you.

BUDGET. And, would you now *defraud the widow and orphan*.

LANDLORD. But

FUNDLORD. Aye, *defraud us* all of the "fruits of our *honest industry*."

BUDGET. And, then, only think of the national honour.

FUNDLORD. Aye, do, do think of the national faith.

LANDLORD. But, Gentlemen, Gentlemen! You won't hear me speak. I did not talk about touching the fruits of any body's "*honest industry*."

FUNDLORD. Aye, I say it again, the "*fruits of our honest industry*," every farthing of it. Our *hard earnings*. And it is a shame to think of "*robbing us of them*."

LANDLORD. But, if you will but hear me, you will find, that I have no intention to *rob* you, as you call it. I wish you to have your interest to the *utmost farthing*.

FUNDLORD. Oa! Dat ish vera vell den!

LANDLORD. Well, Sir, (turning to BUDGET) we have 30 out of the 50 or 60 millions. What are the other millions wanted for?

BUDGET. What! Would you have the King and his family to be beggars?

LANDLORD. Oh, no! Set down a million for the Civil List.

BUDGET. There is the *army*. Don't you see the necessity of that?

LANDLORD. Indeed I do not. Eng'and did very well for centu-

ries without a single standing soldier. And, as to *Colonies*, we should be better without them, if they demand the expence of armies in time of peace. I, therefore, see no necessity for any expence on that account, except to pay the pensions of those who have served in the war.

BUDGET. Nor of the navy, I suppose!

LANDLORD. Oh, yes! As large a navy as during peace in the reign of George the First, to cost about half a million a year.

BUDGET. Nor of any *police*, *big-salaries*, *great pensions*, *grants*, *sinécures*, nor of

LANDLORD. Indeed I do not.

BUDGET. Nor of any *Secret Service* money?

LANDLORD. No faith (*shaking his head*.)

FUNDLORD. Nor I!

BUDGET. Don't you? Then you are a purblind fool, indeed!

LANDLORD. Well, then, we have got, I think to only 32 or 33 millions. What *need* is there of the other 25 or 30 millions?

BUDGET. What *need*! What! Have you forgotten the *Sinking Fund*!

FUNDLORD. Ah! Don't forget de *Shinking Fund* for de love of Moses! Don't forget de *Shinking Fund*! Here is my pen-shil: *mark it down*!

BUDGET. Oh! You are alive now, are you?

LANDLORD. Sinking Fund! Why it has long been called a *humbng*.

FUNDLORD. Ah! Tish vera goot thing. T' makes the money for me.

LANDLORD. For you! What have you to do with it? It was intended for our use. If you get your *interest*, is not that enough for you?

FUNDLORD.—Yes, yes! But, den de Shinking Fund makes de *prinshipal* so goot in de market. Makes it sell so well!

LANDLORD.—What, then, not content with your *interest* for your “*hard earnings*,” but “*purely for love of us*,” you must have besides sums raised upon us annually to be expended in purchases of principal in order to keep up the price of your property!

FUNDLORD.—Yeash, and dat's vera goot.

LANDLORD.—Yes, very good for you; but, where is the justice towards us?

FUNDLORD.—Justice! Why, de justice is de *national honour* Mr. Budget will tell you all about dat.

BUDGET.—Not I! You saw no necessity for salaries, pen-

sions, sinecures, grants and secret-service money; and I shall leave you to answer for yourself. (*Exit BUDGET.*)

LANDLORD.—National honour! Does *that* require that one set of proprietors should tax the rest of the whole nation to raise money to be laid out in a way to keep at a high price the property of that particular set of proprietors? National folly may yield to it; but national *honour* never can demand it.

FUNDLORD.—Mr. Pitt, goot Mr. Pitt, “heaven-born Minister,” did make de bargain.

LANDLORD. — *Bargain*, indeed! And for whom? You may as well tell me of the bargain that old Rebecca made for poor *Esau* in behalf of the sleek and crafty Jacob.

FUNDLORD.—Don't abuse Jacob, Sir, in my hearing!

LANDLORD. — *Your* hearing! It is come to a pretty pass, indeed, when a *Gentleman* is to be silenced by word of command from a fellow that was only the other day carrying an orange basket on his neck.

FUNDLORD.—You a *Shentleman*! My mortgage runs over every inch of land that you call yoursh.

LANDLORD. — You lie, you rascal! (*Kicks him.*)

FUNDLORD.—I'll tear your eysh out! (*Flies at him, fastens in his hair, and exeunt in a scuffle.*)

What is to pass on the other side of the curtain it is not, as yet, given to us to know; but, perhaps, this is no very exaggerated representation of what we shall see and hear long before Peel's Bill arrive at the last stage of its effects.

Mr. WALTER BURRELL spoke like a plain and sincere man. He said, that he had supported the Ministers in the war, in order to obtain an honourable and lasting peace, which peace he expected to produce a great reduction of taxes; but, he now found that the ministers came down with the same demand for establishments as before. This was all very simple, to be sure; but, it was honest, at any rate. Mr. BURRELL should have read the Register always, and then he would not have been deceived. However, his eyes do not appear to be open yet. The taxes have been *doub'ed* since the peace of Paris, in 1814. The Fund-lord, Pensioner, Placeman, Judge, Police-man, and all others, who live on the taxes, actually receive twice as much *wheat* now as they did in 1813. And, it is the *whea*

we are to look at, and not the figures. His remark as to the tax-gatherer "*helping himself first,*" and leaving the landlord not even the means of sparing the tenant is very just: it is precisely what was said by farmer GRUB, in the farce of Sir POMPOUS JOLTERHEAD, which farce has, by-the-by, danced about pretty merrily through the country newspapers, to the great edification, I trust, of the whole of the numerous family of Jolterhead.

Lord MILTON touched on the tender point, on the heel of the Achilles of the system. He could see no reason for raising money to *keep up the price of stock* any more than for raising money to *keep up the price of corn*. That was a good thrust, and a home one! It was a good way of putting the thing. If the reader looks at the *Preliminary Part of Report against Gold*, just published, he will see, that I pressed the necessity of stopping this fund, in 1806! What troubles would have been prevented, if that advice had been followed! Who that has common sense and common soul in him can endure to be oppressed and insulted as this system oppresses and insults every one who has to labour for his livelihood? Indeed, men will not

endure it. To be told to *our heads*, that we are "*robbers*," unless we not only pay the full nominal interest, and double the real interest, but, unless we pay an additional 3 per cent, or thereabouts, to keep up the price of the *principal*; to be told this, and to be compelled to act up to it, too, who will endure that can get away from it? Accordingly thousands are fleeing with what they can scrape together. Sixty inhabitants of the little Isle of Wight, a third part *farmers*, have lately sailed for America in one ship. From Sussex they are following each other in droves. Mr. WALTER BURRELL can tell how many of his farms have been flung up; and, probably, how many of his late tenants are off, or setting off to America! To be sure! Would I stay here to farm, and to pay *double interest* and an annual 3 per cent. besides; and be called a "*robber*" if I grumbled? I would hang myself first.

LORD MILTON was, however, wrong in his notion that the gay cities and towns were marks of *prosperity*. They prove that a *part* prospers. When they are the growth of *time*, they show that the prosperity is *general*. But, they must, in this case, be

the growth of ages. When mere shuffling clerks, and orange boys, get to be *millioners*, during a few years; ten, twenty, or thirty; when this is the case, the *prosperity* is false. All must come out of *labour*. It can come from nothing else. And labour will not, in a short space of time, create so many fine showy things, if it have its due wages to be consumed by the labourer. The *slow* surplus of labour will create fine showy things; but, if labour be robbed of its *due*, of what it needs, in order to create fine things, those things are no proof of *prosperity*. And his lordship is very much deceived, if he imagines, that our fine things are to remain, if the taxing system is to be brought down, I beg him to bear this in mind: Peel's Bill knocks the eyes out of Scrip-Castles, and replaces the notes of the Piano by the chackling of the Jack-daw, as sure as his lordship has a head upon his shoulders. Thirty thousand attorneys and ten thousand bankers and bankers' clerks and a hundred thousand tax-gatherers and twenty or thirty thousand half-pay officers and a hundred thousand nabobs have arisen out of this system, and can be upheld *only by this system*! Let his lordship bear

that in mind. You do right, Sir, in getting this tax repealed; but, it is, I promise you, no *holiday* affair upon which you are entering.

Mr. VANSITTART expressed his apprehension that this "was the *first of a series of attacks upon the finances of the country.*" What an idea! What language! Just as if you and the rest of the *landlords* were persons *not belonging to the country!* Just as if the finances of the country were something that proceeded from *sources with which you had nothing to do!* Why, this very language is, of itself, enough to rouse the blood of cowards by nature. That the *muck-worm*; the fat and saucy millionaire of 'Change Alley should talk thus is natural enough; but, to hear this language from a man in office, living on the taxes, and to hear it addressed, too, to those who *own the country!* Mr. VAN seems to have thought better of this before the next meeting, as we shall by and-by see.

To be sure it is the "*first of a series of attacks,*" if attacks they must be called. It is, in fact, a little bit of a step towards doing justice to the people at large as well as to the landlords; for, if Mr. HUSKISSON's doctrine be true

(and true it is with the exception before mentioned) that the horse-tax is finally paid by the consumer of food, the whole of the nation, the tax-eaters excepted, are gainers by the measure. To be sure it is the first of a *series*; for, of itself it is nothing at all. And, how good it is in its way you may gather from the conduct of the long-eared, tooting, press, with regard to it. The tooter is, you see, hampered. It does not know what to say. It says little, and that little is of no meaning. If you proceed thus, you will absolutely kill the tooter, who belongs to the paper-system, mind; and you will see that it will die with the system. If you had proceeded in the other way: if you had proposed to reduce the interest, you would have had the tooter upon you, and must have crammed your ears with cotton, or have scampered off to Cumberland *ventre à terre*.

Mr. VAN's idea, that it was the "*first duty* of parliament to "support the financial system" was of a piece with the other observation. A first duty, indeed! To do what, to surrender up the last acre and last drop of sweat to the fund-lords! This is, indeed, what *has* been deemed the first duty, if we may judge

from what has, for years, been doing. But, I think we shall see a very different course pursued in future. And, notwithstanding some trifling blunders, you, Sir, shall not be forgotten as claiming, and fairly claiming, the honour of having *led the way*.

Mr. HUSKISSON said, that "*our capital was growing*," and that "*he saw no reason to despond*." By "*our*" what does he mean? And what does he call *capital*? Capital is *things of real value*; things of *intrinsic worth*. And, are these *growing*? The *Debt* is growing; and this is "*Capital*" in Mr. MABERLY's eyes, which are as sharp as *needles*, and who can *turn* an idea of this sort, and *line* it through-out, *skirts* and all, and put it *out of hands* as neatly as any one of Mr. James Perry's "*financiers*," though on his list, there are, besides Mr. Maberly, a Baring, a Grenfell and "*a Ricardo*!" Capital, indeed! Is the farmer's capital *growing*? Is the landlord's capital *growing*? Is the merchant's capital *growing*? Is the manufacturer's capital *growing*? As we used to say, in the country, like a cow's tail, growing *downwards*. The tax-eaters may, indeed, say, "*our capital is growing*;" for grow

it does over yours as the rascally weeds are, at this very moment, growing over your fifty acres and my five rod of Swedish Turnips. I shall rescue my turnips by transplanting, and I would advise you to do the same; and this is the way that the emigrating farmers are going to work! They find the fund-lord weeds too strong for them, and they are moving off to America, leaving their late companions and fellow sufferers, who are too tender or too stunted to bear removing, to be stifled by Mr. HUSKISSON's *growing plants*.

This gentleman can see "*no reason to despond*;" and, for that very reason you ought to *push on*; for, until *he* despond, *you* may. When he begins to despond, you may begin to hope; but not before. In another view, however, his comrades and the fund-lords ought to be alarmed at this declaration of his. He has a *head*, and that is more than I can say for any one of his comrades; and, if *he* can think, that Peel's Bill can go into full effect without a reduction of the taxes to one half, *aye half*, their present nominal amount; if *he* can think this, what pretty pates is the system committed to! *Can* he entertain any such belief? *Can* he have thought of the matter, and enter-

tain such belief? If this be possible, all that I can say is, nothing is impossible in the way of belief; and it is possible for your dairy-maid to believe, that a pound of cream contains two pounds of butter.

We now come, Sir, to the actual passing (or as good) of this your memorable bill; for *memorable* it will become, be you assured. I have the proceedings of the 18th of June now before me; and, that they give me pleasure inexpressible I need not say. On your first moving, on the 14th of June, you had a majority of 28 against the Ministers. There were, 141 for you, and 113 against you. Mr. VAN threatened you with another trial of force and numbers; but, when the hour of trial came he gave way in "*so handsome a manner!*" He was "*pretty behaved;*" and, if you push on he will behave still *prettier* next Session.

The business of this day was opened by you in the following words:

"The Honourable Member stated, that he was happy to be enabled to inform the House, that Ministers did not intend to give any further opposition to the Bill (loud cheers). He was sure this would be satisfactory to the country at large, while it also proved to Government that

"the introduction of a system of economy was indispensable, not only to make up the deficiency caused by the repeal of this tax, but to enable them to relieve the country from other burdens, which still pressed heavily on its industry and resources (hear, hear!). He was gratified that the Noble Lord (Londonderry) felt, as he did in this instance, what was beneficial to the country, and *for the handsome manner* in which that feeling was communicated, he could *not but express* his public acknowledgments (hear, hear!)."

Now, why this *praise*? It was not due. You know well that he was *compelled to yield, or yield his place*. You are not aware, perhaps, of the *mischief* of such praises. You will find, in the end, that they will be used against yourself. I speak here with some experience to back my opinion. I was, for many years, a *great praiser*. I was more prodigal of praise than ever even Perceval was of the public money. I have had to expiate this sin of prodigality by undergoing all the pains and penalties that the blackest ingratitude in the most base and sordid breasts have been able to invent and execute; and, perhaps, it has been owing more to good fortune than to any thing else, that my very blood has not been shed by the hands, or the hirelings, of men, with regard

to whom I had never committed any offence, other than that of loading them with unmerited praise. Take warning, then, Sir; and if you *praise*, let it be the *act*, and *expressly confined to the act*; for, if it admit of a wider interpretation, and you should find it, hereafter, necessary to disapprove of the conduct of the praised party, some black-hearted and high-fed knave, who has a longing eye upon the public purse, and who fears your vigilance, may be found to reproach you with "*inconsistency*."

Next came Mr. VAN, and I wish I could have seen him! Pray, Sir, how did he look, while uttering the following words?

"The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that however important he considered the tax on agricultural horses as affecting the finances, he felt himself bound to bow to what appeared to be the decided opinion of the House. A decisive majority of the House were in favour of the Bill, and having consulted the opinion of competent persons out of doors since the division he was induced to conclude that such was the general feeling. That being the case he would not set up his individual opinion against it, and he hoped that no man standing in his situation would ever do so. Though he did not think the repeal of the tax of vital importance to the people at large, yet he trusted the sacrifice on the part of the revenue would be well received by the country. That it might have the effect of conciliating the public feeling and allaying irritation, was taken into the account in coming to the pre-

sent determination, and whatever was done for the agricultural interests was worthy of the sacrifice (hear!)."

Ah, a! my little man! You can "*bow*" can you after hearing some persons "*out of doors*."

"Competent persons out of doors." Competent! Aye to be sure! Have I not said, a thousand times, that we "*out of doors*" folks were the statesmen, after all? That is *right*.

"Consult" the people "*out of doors*." They will always tell you what to do. They are "*competent*." You remember, I

dare say, Mr. VAN, my old proposition for collecting legislators by straining a string across the entrance to London by Tyburn, Knightsbridge, Kennington, Kent Road, or Whitechapel, avoiding the northern inlets for reasons that the *Edinburgh Reviewers* could probably inform you of. You remember this proposition, I dare say, and how it was abused; but, when we find you "*bowing*" instead of kicking "*within doors*," in consequence of "*consultations with competent persons out of doors*," does my proposition for catching legislators by the legs appear to be so very extravagant?

But now comes the great man of all; the thunder of "*thun-*

“ *derers.*” What! Can he “ *bow*”
 too! Then, fund-lords, look to
 yourselves: pack up your wallets
 and take to the long boat. Here
 he comes; the Jupiter of the po-
 litical heaven. Hushed be every
 voice!

“ The Marquess of LONDON-
 “ DERRY stated that there was no
 “ necessity for the introduction
 “ of collateral topics. He felt it
 “ his duty, like his Right Ho-
 “ nourable Colleague, to bow
 “ to the decision of the House.
 “ He was prevented by indispo-
 “ sition from attending the de-
 “ bate on the former night, but
 “ if he could have attended, he
 “ should then have stated to the
 “ House the importance of sus-
 “ taining the revenues of the
 “ country, which were so essen-
 “ tial to the public credit (hear,
 “ hear!) After the manner, how-
 “ ever, in which the House had
 “ declared its opinions, and tak-
 “ ing into account the amount of
 “ the tax, compared with the ad-
 “ vantage which its repeal was
 “ thought to produce to the Agri-
 “ cultural interests, and the effect
 “ it might have in *conciliation*,
 “ he did not wish that the propo-
 “ sition should be refused
 “ (hear, hear!); at the same time
 “ he considered that conceding
 “ the repeal was not so much a

“ measure of relief as a measure
 “ of *sympathy*, and if it was
 “ within the range of legislation
 “ to apply effectual relief to the
 “ Agricultural interests, such re-
 “ lief was what *he should have*
 “ *wished to have bestowed.* (hear!)
 “ However although this could
 “ not be an effectual measure, it
 “ was *better that there should be*
 “ *no more struggle about it.* It
 “ was given as a *boon*, and he
 “ trusted would have the effect of
 “ producing the *satisfaction*
 “ which the concession was *meant*
 “ *to carry through the country.*
 “ That there existed a strong
 “ feeling to relieve the agricultu-
 “ rists in the Committee which had
 “ their case under consideration,
 “ he was convinced their Report,
 “ which had been drawn up that
 “ day, would satisfactorily prove;
 “ and he said in the hearing of
 “ several Members who belonged
 “ to that Committee, and could
 “ bear out his assertion, that if
 “ the state of circumstances, and
 “ the continuation of causes which
 “ affected the agricultural inte-
 “ rests, could admit of imme-
 “ diate and permanent remedy,
 “ such remedy would have been
 “ pointed out, and he believed
 “ promptly carried into effect
 “ He need not go into their de-
 “ liberations, but, when con

"sidered in reference to the
 "circumstances under which the
 "Report was drawn up, to the
 "difficulties and complexity of
 "the subject, he was sure that
 "it would be an argument to all,
 "that the Committee were most
 "willing to apply whatever re-
 "lief was practicable, and that
 "the country would acknowledge
 "the zeal and diligence which
 "distinguished their exertions.
 "If, besides, the repeal of the
 "present tax could carry a mo-
 "ment of satisfaction to that most
 "valuable branch of the public
 "interests, for whose benefit it
 "was more particularly intended
 "he would feel that no small
 "cause of gratification. As
 "to what the Honourable Mem-
 "ber had said, relative to the
 "substitution of another tax, in
 "lieu of this one, he believed his
 "Right Honourable Colleague
 "was not to be precluded by the
 "concession from acting upon
 "circumstances as he deemed
 "best for the public interest;
 "but then if *the boon* was to
 "carry satisfaction to the coun-
 "try, unaccompanied by any
 "present proposal of the kind,
 "the country had it [hear!].
 "He (Lord L.) was not present
 "on the former night, to bear
 "the brunt of the action [a

"laugh], but he would now
 "take the opportunity of stating,
 "that he did hope, after Go-
 "vernment should have sub-
 "mitted in the next Sessions of
 "Parliament *Resolutions of*
 "*Economy and Retrenchment*
 "[cheers], if it were found ne-
 "cessary to replace that Tax, in
 "order to sustain the credit of
 "the country on the high stand-
 "ard on which it should ever be
 "placed, *the House would re-*
 "*collect this Tax had been given*
 "*up* [hear, hear!]. As to him-
 "self, he was perfectly prepared
 "along with his Right Hon.
 "Friend, *to undergo the ordeal*
 "*of public economy.*"

Well done thunderer! This
 "*general working of events*" seems
 to be producing miracles. Here
 is "*conciliation*," here is "*satis-*
 "*faction*," here is "*gratifica-*
 "*tion*," and, O, ye gods of
 "thunder," here is "*sympathy*,"
 all exhibited in, or to be pro-
 duced by the repeal of a half-
 million horse-tax! However,
 this is a tone very different from
 that of Mr. VAN, and of Mr.
 HUSKISSON, who, on the 14th, an-
 nounced, pretty plainly, that, if the
 measure were persevered in, the
present ministers could not carry
on the government. And, it dif-
 fers a little, too, from what this

same *thunderer* said during the debates on the proposed repeal of the *malt-tax*, when he bade the friends of the repeal not "*holloo till they were out of the wood*," and when he distinctly declared, that, if the measure was carried, *he would not be one to attempt to carry on the government*.

I do not make these remarks, Sir, in the way of taunt; for it was *right* to give way; but, in order to shew how events do really *work*. There is no doubt in my mind, that Lord CASTLE-REAGH, or Londonderry, or whatever his name is, knew that he could not beat you on a division; or, at least, he knew, that the *consequence* of his triumph, if he obtained it, would be his final permanent defeat as a minister; for, I dare say, that he had seen and heard enough to convince him, that the resentment arising, in the breasts of many of his steady supporters, from a refusal of this pitiful "*boon*," would be such as to send many of them across the House. Therefore, while the act was *right* in itself, it was *prudence* to yield to it. And, as to any good that we should get from a *change of ministry*, that is by no means worth thinking about. Indeed, nobody cares a straw about the matter; and,

for my own part, I should be sorry to see it; because it would only *confuse* a thing that is now quite clear. It would only set the tooting press to work to bother people's brains, and to disturb a new stream of measures and events, which it is so delightful to observe rolling naturally along

All that my good lord says about "*a boon*;" about "*conciliation*;" about "*satisfaction*" and "*sympathy*;" all his compliments to "*that most valuable branch of the public interests*" (a new-coined phrase); all his talk about "*economy next session*"; all these only tend to show, that he does not see what is *going to happen*. It may, indeed, *smooth down* some few ruffled persons, for the moment. But, their very estates are *at stake*; and, though my lord may think to win them by soft words and by "*booing*," he will find, and that, too, long before next session, that soft words and "*booing*" will do nothing in an affair of *lands or no lands*; for, *that is the question*, disguise it how he, or any one else, may.

Our old friend, CANNING, too, Sir, will find that he has a *new element* to move in. He will now have to contend, not with

RADICALS, but with those whom he once ventured to call (in a speech in answer to Mr. COKE) "landed grandees." This will puzzle him. Flashes of what he thinks "wit" will not avail him much in this new theatre. He gave, it appears, a *silent vote* against your bill. That was the wise course. If the paper-system go, *Reform comes*; and yet, go it must, or the landlords are ruined. And, will it not, then, be difficult for Mr. CANNING to act his part? It is not "*Westminster's Pride and England's Glory*" that will have to do with him. He will find that the job is a tougher one than he ever yet had a hand in. Talent and genius he has, but not fitted for scenes such as are at hand. Declamation is of little use, when you have to persuade men to give up their houses and land. During the debate on the *Six Acts*, in support of which he was a strenuous advocate, he observed, with regard to *writers*, that it was impossible to pass a law to apply only to a *single offender*; and that, to get at *one mischievous animal*, that mixed with others of a different description, *you must hunt down the whole herd*. This was a beautiful idea, to be sure, and so consonant, too, with

that maxim of the law, "let ten guilty escape than one innocent suffer." However, the "witty" gentleman will find, that he has not now "*revered and ruptured Ogdens*" to deal with. The "landed grandees," however they may have been delighted with jests cut upon others, will not relish jests cut upon themselves. And, therefore, I think that our old friend, CANNING, may as well endeavour to keep quiet. His acting has, in the last instance, been pretty successful; and he would, perhaps, do well to drop the curtain and retire to the Green Room.

Mr. PEEL was the *stoutest* of your opponents; that is to say, he showed most bottom. Mr. BARING was, indeed, when he saw the tax actually going, very furious. He reproached poor Mr. VAN with having *brought the thing upon himself* by boasting of his flourishing revenue. "In fact," said he, "the Right Honourable Gentleman had done what had been often done in this world by people who had more money than wisdom, and who, by boasting of their wealth, drew upon themselves the attacks of thieves" [*cheers and loud laughter!*]" And, was *laughter all!* There

was a time, when *English Gentlemen* would not have *laughed* at such a simile! This is a specimen of what we have to expect to hear before this struggle is over. Mr. PEELE was more dignified in his disapprobation: his sorrow was of a more solemn cast. He "felt himself compelled to dissent from the tone of congratulation, on this event, which seemed to be so general in the House. He must say, that he regretted the repeal of the Tax. He regretted it, because he was persuaded that it ought to be the object of all the interests in the country to maintain the public credit. He thought that this repeal would be more to be lamented, if the advice of the Noble Member for Yorkshire, namely, that as a boon had been granted to the Agriculturist, a similar boon should be granted to the Manufacturer, were listened to. The interests, neither of the one class nor of the other, would, in his opinion, be consulted, by a measure tending, as this certainly did, in some degree, to impair public credit. For that reason, he confessed that he would have been anxious rather to maintain the Revenue at its present amount, which, it had been sufficiently proved, was

"not larger than circumstances demanded."

Thus, you see, Sir, there is no cure for persons of this description. Here is a man, who is himself the author of a bill that has actually doubled the amount of the taxes, and he thinks that this double amount ought to be collected! To reason with such a person is out of the question. If a man can go on with this Pitt-talk, at a time when all is changed; at a time when the very same farmers, who were rolling in wealth, are running from the kingdom, in order to save the remnant of their property; if a man can talk thus, at such a time, there is no sense in talking with him.

The whole system is doomed to fall, and it is high time it fell. Your bill, Sir, is the first successful hit at it in the way of deducting from its means. These means will, and must, be taken away, unless we get back into bales of paper; and, then, a convulsive end is certain. If the means be taken away, the system dies that way. The carriers on of the system will find themselves weak, they will hardly know why. They will find their adherents dropping off from them, they will not know what cause.

Feebleness will come all over the **THING** without the **THING'S** being able to account for it. It will lose the use of its fangs without any one appearing to do any thing to it. It will become as gentle and as harmless as a lamb. In fact, you are bleeding the **THING** in the foot. Go on thus, and it will die without a struggle, and order, harmony, and happiness will once more surround the throne of an English king.

To carp at the ministers, in this case, as a part of the long-eared press does, is purely *factious*, and it is very base too, seeing that their yielding was *right* and has a manifest tendency to the *general good*, as, indeed, the taking off of any tax has. As to "a *boon*," it is foolish, if not very imprudent, to call that a *boon*, which is merely a diminution of intolerable taxation. However, the thing is good in itself, and better as to the *hope* that it will inspire. It will make some men *hesitate*, who are preparing to quit the country with their capitals; and, if the malt-tax were taken off early in the next session, it would prevent, I verily believe, ten thousand farmers from going to America. They will not remain to give up their all

first, and then go to work solely for the benefit of others. They will not do this; and as I said in my Leave-taking Address, in 1817, if the system be pushed on, without relaxation, "it is impossible for tongue or pen to describe the base and wretched state into which this nation will fall."

It was, when I began this letter, my intention to make some remarks on a book, which a Mr. MUSCHETT, a Clerk of the Mint, has put forth, in order to show, that the **FUND-LORDS** *do not receive more than they ought*. But, I must defer this till my next; for, the subject is very important, and will demand room. This is, I take it, the *grand battery* of the **FUND-LORDS**; and you shall see how completely I will demolish it, in spite of all that the long-eared, braying, tooting press can do in its defence. Much has been done of late. The last six month's Registers, beginning with the "*New Year's Gift to the Farmers*," have really created a new mind in thousands upon thousands of persons, who now clearly see that which I never could persuade them to look at before. However, it is the *suffering* that is the great *teacher*. The suffering it was that taught the Labour-

ing Classes in 1816 and 1817; and the suffering is now teaching the farmers and landlords. It was urged against your bill, that the Farmers did not petition against taxes. Oh, no! And for reasons fully explained in my letter to Mr. ATTWOOD, and in that to Mr. HAYES! The farmers vainly hoped, poor Bullfrogs, that the parliament could give them high-prices. But, they will now petition against taxes, I hope! And, the man is a mere ideot, who does not see, that every tax taken off, be it what it may, finally benefits the whole of the community. There are, however, taxes that press more immediately on husbandry, and that have the effect too, of checking produce, and such are those terrible taxes, the malt and the salt-tax. But, "one thing at one time." You must get on by degrees.

I am, Sir,

Your most humble

And most obedient Servant,

WM. COBBETT.

AGRICULTURAL HORSE TAX.

House of Commons, 14 June, 1821.

Mr. CURWEN said, that in rising to call the attention of the House to the important subject of which he had given notice, he extremely regretted the lateness of the period in the Ses-

sion, which rendered it imperative on him to proceed, notwithstanding the absence of the Noble Marquess. He the more regretted this, because when the subject was laid before the House, the Noble Marquess had earnestly entreated him to wait until the termination of the inquiry by the Committee on Agricultural Distress, pledging himself to support the proposition, should the result of that inquiry be to recommend it. With that request he (Mr. Curwen) had complied. The Right Honourable Chancellor of the Exchequer had also said, that any such recommendation on the part of the Agricultural Committee would be a strong inducement with him to comply with the proposition. The object, which he had in view was one most material to the interests of Agriculture. The Tax had always been unjust in principle, and oppressive in practice. But the question now wore a very different aspect from that which it assumed when he had formerly brought it under the consideration of the House. *Formerly he had felt it to be his duty to propose some substitute to supply the deficiency which the Repeal of the Tax in question was calculated to occasion in the Revenue.* But things were now in a different state. The Right Hon. Gentleman had since had abundant opportunities of obviating the evil. Not only must the Right Hon. Gentleman have been well aware of the extent of the existing agricultural distress, but he must have well known what had passed in the Committee appointed to investigate the causes of that agricultural distress which every one acknowledged to be unprecedented in extent. The result of the inquiries of that Committee had been, that although there existed a variety of opinions in it on other parts of the subject, on that of the agricultural distress, *and of the necessity of affording speedy relief to that distress, the Committee came to an unanimous resolution that the distress of the country was fully proved.* With such a resolution (whatever difference of opinion might exist on other subjects), what would be the impression of the country if it should turn out that Parliament throughout the whole Session had abstained from taking a single earthly step to afford the relief acknowledged

to be indispensable [hear!]? To the vote of that night, therefore, the country would look, that they might estimate what they might expect from Parliament; for, it was evident, that if the Report of the Committee were to be made in the present session, it was too late to found any measure upon it. He put it, therefore, to the house, what answer they would make to his constituents, if they were asked why they did not adopt the proposition which he was about to submit to them? Would it be becoming in them to say, that because they found they could not give all, they therefore refused to give any thing? He must again express his regret that the Noble Marquess was not present, because he felt it his duty to say that, in his opinion, the present administration did not show the feeling which they ought for agriculture. At the opening of the present Session, there was not a word in the Speech from the Throne on the subject of the distress of agriculture. His Majesty's Ministers appeared, therefore, either to be ignorant of the extent of that distress, or indifferent to it. It was with him a matter of no doubt, that there never could be any description of prosperity in this country, while agriculture remained in a distressed state. The Right Hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer had, during the last two months, been repeatedly intreated to reconsider his estimates. He (Mr. Curwen) was persuaded that if the Session were now to recommence, the majority would declare that these estimates ought to be reduced. Government ought not to have trusted to any Committees; but, taking a view of the state of the country, have made those retrenchments which would have enabled the House to sacrifice to the agriculturists this boon. Trifling as it was, it would be received with gratitude, and would have a *most advantageous effect*. In the course of the discussions in the Committee, a Resolution was agreed to, to instruct the Chairman to move for the repeal of this tax; though, subsequently, *it was decided not to do so until the Report was made*. This circumstance had occasioned the delay in his motion. He confidently anticipated that the present decision of the House would be now to begin that

work which they *must afterwards carry to a much greater length* (hear). It was most unjust to call on the Agriculturists alone to make sacrifices; let them be made equally *by all classes of the community*. Was it possible that nearly one half of the whole income of the country could continue to be collected in taxation? In his opinion, it was utterly impossible. Unless some permanent protection could be granted to the Agriculturist, the only alternative was to *cut down the expences of our establishment at home and abroad from the King to the lowest officer in the State* (hear, hear!) But had any disposition been evinced thus to relieve the burdens of the people? None whatever. It had been stated by some Honourable Gentlemen, that the Tax under consideration was a very trifling one; *on the light soil* it was not much, but on the heavy soils it amounted to three per cent. on the rent. It was a Tax the principle of which was most unjust, being a *Tax on the Plough*, and fell most heavily on those who were the least able to bear it; the Tax not only bore hard, but exposed the farmer to endless vexations; for, contrary to the law of the land, the Tax Office *pronounced every man guilty till he was proved innocent*, and the number of surcharges was in consequence enormous, having been no fewer than 139,000 in the year. If a farmer once crossed a horse, he was charged with a pleasure horse, and his ploughman was charged as a groom. These were vexations which ought to be corrected. To shew how vexatiously the assessed taxes were levied, he instanced the case of a poor woman in the neighbourhood of Berwick, who having paid sixpence to a man to prune a favourite fruit tree, was surcharged with an occasional gardener, and her goods were actually sold to pay the tax (hear, hear!). Some persons thought it necessary the inferior grounds should go out of cultivation; that he expressly denied. *Every acre in the country ought to be brought into cultivation*; for what was the evil which the country at present endured above any other *but want of employment*? And was that evil to be aggravated instead of diminished? If there were an increase of employment, an increased price of

the necessaries of life would be of little moment. Cheap bread *without work* would at length, he was convinced, be found to be a great evil, as destructive of our manufactures as of our agriculture. The repeal of the Malt Tax (although he voted for it) *would not have afforded so great a relief to the farmer as the repeal of the Agricultural Horse Tax.* The country had a right to demand some sacrifices to relieve it. This was the only remaining opportunity to effect such an object, and he called upon the House, therefore, to concur in his proposition, which was for leave to bring in a Bill to repeal so much of the 43rd and 52nd of Geo. III. as related to the Duty on Horses employed in Agriculture.

Mr. GOOCH seconded the motion. He confirmed the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the Resolution which the Committee had adopted, to instruct the Chairman to move for the repeal of this Tax, although they had eventually relinquished the proposition. If ever there was an unjust and oppressive tax, it was the present. He most strongly recommended the repeal. It was a coarse but true saying, that "*you could not have more of a cat than its skin;*" and the agriculturists were, in fact, unable to pay the tax. (Hear, hear.) If we could not increase our means, *we must diminish our expenditure.* (Hear, hear.) Much as he differed in politics from the Hon. Member for Aberdeen, he must say that *he thought that Hon. Member had done great service to the country.* (Loud and reiterated cries of hear, hear, hear.) He did not say this for the purpose of *catching popularity*, or to hurt the feelings of his Honourable and Right Honourable Friends near him; but because he could *not meet his Constituents without performing the duty which he owed to them in making this declaration.* (Hear.)

Mr. DAVENPORT said he felt himself bound to support the motion. The tax upon Agricultural Horses pressed most severely upon the farmer. Taxing such horses was, in fact, taxing industry, as without horses neither the plough or harrow could be worked.

Mr. COKE (of Norfolk) said, it was to him delightful to hear the language used upon this occasion by those Gen-

tlemen who had been hitherto the undivided supporters of Ministers. He felt particularly gratified by what had fallen from the Honourable Chairman of the Agricultural Committee (Mr. Gooch) upon the motion of his Hon. Friend (Mr. Curwen) the Member for Carlisle. He (Mr. Coke) was an old Member of Parliament, and he could vouch for the unusual exertion and industry of his Honourable Friend. (Hear, hear.) The Chairman of the Agricultural Committee (Mr. Gooch) had stated, that the Agriculturalists were in the greatest state of distress, and that the present tax ought to be removed; and yet he was one of those who had uniformly supported Ministers in every measure which was proposed to burden the country. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Coke) had uniformly opposed Ministers, not from a desire of opposition, but from a conviction that their measures, if pursued, would bring ruin and destruction on the country. He would agree with the Honourable Member (Mr. Gooch) in supporting this motion, not because he felt that it would afford any effectual relief, but because he was anxious to lay hold of all he could to reduce the burdens of the people. (Hear, hear.) He hoped that those Gentlemen who complained of public distresses would exert themselves in opposing the lavish expenditure by which those distresses were produced.

Mr. GIPPS thought the House must see the necessity of supporting the motion. The Hon. Member was proceeding to state at some length the effects produced upon the agricultural interests of the country by the Corn Laws, when

Mr. M. A. BARING rose to order. He put it to the Hon. Member whether the question of the Corn Laws was at all mixed up with the subject then under discussion?

The SPEAKER said, that it was for the Hon. Member (Mr. Gipps) to consider how far he could bring the arguments upon which he was then entering to bear upon the question under discussion.

Mr. GIPPS bowed to the opinions of the Chair. He concluded by observing that he would support the motion from a conviction that, however small, it would be received as a boon by the landed interest of the country.

Mr. BARING commenced by apologizing to the Honourable Member who had just sat down, for having interrupted him. He would, in his observations on this subject, confine himself strictly to what had fallen from the Honourable Gentleman opposite. He (Mr. Baring) was one of those who had used their best endeavours to enforce retrenchment and economy upon Ministers during the late grants, but unfortunately without effect. Those extravagant grants having however been carried, he could not agree to weaken the revenue by repealing the tax in question. And he could not help expressing his surprise that gentlemen should pretend to return to their constituents with a good grace after having supported the whole of the present burthens on the country, merely because they advocated the repeal of this solitary tax. Gentlemen on the opposite side might differ with him upon certain points, but upon no one of all the numerous divisions which had taken place upon the reductions proposed by the Honourable Member for Aberdeen, were the names of the Honourable Member (Mr. Gooch), or the other gentlemen who opposed this tax, to be found (hear, hear!). Yet the whole of those gentlemen had concluded their speeches by advocating retrenchment, notwithstanding their having supported every grant, however extravagant, proposed by Ministers. *The first duty of the House* was to look to the expenditure of the country, and that being voted they were bound to provide for it. The Honourable Member next animadverted upon the injustice of those arguments, which tended to point out the necessity of *seizing upon the security of the public creditor*, in order to relieve the distresses of the country. The money lent to Government was advanced during a *period of exigency*, and though we were now in a state of peace, he would ask what would be the situation of the country in the event of any fluctuation in the affairs of Europe, or in the event of a war with America? In either case we must have recourse to *public credit*; but how could that application be made with effect, if no reliance could be placed upon the securities already given?

Mr. BENETT (of Wiltshire), after

a few words upon what had fallen from Honourable Members on the other side, besought the House to grant this small boon to the agriculturalists, as it would shew that Parliament was not totally inattentive to their situation. He would give his most strenuous support to the motion.

Mr. W. BURRELL supported the motion, not from a feeling that it would afford relief, but because he felt that it was an unjust tax upon the agriculturist, and because it was a tax which operated more severely upon the holders of bad than of good ground. He would, for instance, take Romney Marsh, with which he was well acquainted. There the whole land was in pasture, and of course no agricultural horses were used. It would be as just to tax the cows and sheep which fed upon that land, as to tax the horses by which other lands were worked. It was said by the Honourable Member for Norfolk (Mr. Coke), that Gentlemen on his (Mr. Burrell's) side of the House usually supported Ministers [hear, hear!] He for one had supported Ministers during the war, for the purpose of obtaining an honourable and lasting peace, and with a view to the repeal of many of our taxes [hear, hear?]. But what was the consequence? We had now all but the Property Tax, and that he supposed we should soon have too [hear, hear!]. These Ministers came down with the same expenditure, and without any view to economy [cheers from the Opposition Benches]. It was true that there had been a reduction of 10,000 men, raised at a time when the public peace was disturbed, but these men ought to have been restored to their homes at the moment that tranquillity was restored [hear, hear!] He thought that the taxes imposed on landed property operated to the ruin of the country. Now, the *tax-gatherer helped himself first*. If the landlord did not receive his rent, he did not distraint, because it would have the effect of throwing the land upon his own hands; but the *tax-gatherer had no such feeling*. He called upon the landed interest to support this motion. It was impossible that the country could be relieved unless the army was cut down, and unless economy was introduced into every branch of the public expenditure.—He would

support the present motion, 'as well as every other motion for real practical economy which should be made in the House [hear, hear !].

LORD MILTON said, that if the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. Burrell) called upon the House to protect the landed interest, he (Lord Milton) would extend that call, he would call upon the Members of that House, the Representatives of the country, and of its various interests, its manufactures, commercial and funded, to stop the career of that taxation, which affected every class of the community. He would put it to his Honourable Friend, the Member for Taunton, that even on his view of maintaining the funded interests, taxation ought to be diminished. The capital of the country constituted the security of the funds; it was by that capital, that what was called public credit could be alone maintained; it would be, therefore, wiser and better to leave that capital in the pockets of the people to increase and to fructify, than to impoverish them by excessive taxation; by such taxation they would ultimately be rendered unable to pay what at present they met with great difficulty. He agreed with the Hon. Gentleman, that the tax under consideration was a monstrous tax; it was a tax upon the implements used by the industrious population; it was a tax which operated unequally and of course unfairly. In proportion as the Manufacturer of Corn carried on his business at great expence, the tax weighed heavily upon him. But the Labourer who worked at a light soil, and who therefore used fewer horses, was subject to a light tax, and the wealthy grazier literally paid nothing. He (Lord Milton) was not only for relieving the Agriculturist from oppressive taxation, but he thought that the manufacturer was equally entitled to the consideration of that House; and now, in the year 1821, he could not do better than refer to the speech of a Prince, whose counsels were governed by that wise Administration which for 25 years up to the Treaty of Utrecht, had remained in power. His Majesty, on addressing his Parliament, had said that it was worthy of their attention to weigh well, to consider the duties on the importation of raw materials, for the purposes of manufacture in this country, with a view to make those duties as low as good policy would admit of. Nothing to him (Lord Milton) could appear more wise than to

make the duties on the raw material we import as moderate as possible. If heavy and unwise taxation were to be kept up on the manufacturer, he alone would not be the sufferer: the farmer and the landlord would share in his hardships & depression. It was by the industry of the manufacturers—it was by the enterprise and efforts of commercial men, that the rents of this country were paid. If, from a narrow and erroneous view, the burthen of taxation were shifted on the manufacturer, for the protection of the agriculturist, the consequence would be, that the country would be driven back to the state of agricultural Poland. But would any man wish to see the country reduced to that state—would any man who looked at its condition, who considered the wealth that had been accumulated by trade, the great improvement that followed, the number of beautiful cities and flourishing towns which spread themselves over the face of the country, wish, by an unwise interference with our commerce and manufactures, to reduce the country to the state of agricultural Poland and of Russia? If the House took an enlarged view of the state of the country, they would turn their thoughts to the amount of the taxation by which it was pressed down; it was not wise to consider any particular tax;—the whole question of taxation and expenditure ought to be brought under consideration—taxation, not as it affected the agricultural class, or the manufacturing class, but the country at large. If, indeed, one tax more than another deserved to be repealed, it was the Malt Tax, because the Malt Tax was more particularly felt. With respect to the tax on agricultural horses, he would heartily vote for its repeal; and should the Bill be carried to a Committee, he would move for the repeal of the tax on foreign wool. The Noble Lord next observed, that as to maintaining the public faith of the country, he was not for breaking that faith. But was not the public faith more than maintained? There was at present a surplus revenue of four millions. That fund was preserved, not as a Sinking Fund—it would be ridiculous to call it a Sinking Fund, on the principle on which Mr. Pitt had originally established it. The plan of Mr. Pitt was one of doubtful policy at best, but when it was once broken in upon, it might be interfered with to any extent. At present, a sum of four millions was

applied by sending Commissioners into the market, *for the purpose of raising the price of stock.* Why, he asked, might not that sum be applied to *keep up the price of land or of corn?* To send persons into the market to raise the price of stocks above their natural price, appeared to him, under the circumstances of the country, to be perfectly unwise. He would vote for the repeal of the present tax, because he felt convinced that by reducing taxation the House would promote economy. So it was at the time of the repeal of the Property Tax. Notwithstanding the previous declaration of Ministers that they would stand or fall by the tax, the tax was repealed—Ministers kept their places—withdraw the estimates which had been previously prepared, and substituted other estimates considerably lower in amount. The repeal of taxes was, he felt convinced, the only means of forcing economy upon an Administration which seemed determined not to diminish the expenditure of the country unless where they were *compelled to do so.* Under this impression he begged to declare his intention, that in the event of his Hon. Friend carrying the Bill to a Committee, he would move instructions to the Committee to introduce a clause into the Bill for the repeal of the Tax on Foreign Wool.—(A laugh from the Ministerial side.) The object of his Honourable Friend was to force upon the Ministers a system of economy to the amount of 480,000l.; he would wish to add a sum of 180,000l. more, though indeed it could be scarcely said that the repeal of the tax on foreign wool would take any thing out of the pocket of Ministers, for he was convinced that so far from decreasing the revenue, the repeal of the tax would have a direct contrary effect.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the motion before the House was not intended merely to repeal the tax on agricultural horses. The Noble Lord gave notice of his intention to move for the repeal of the tax on foreign wool, and the repeal of the malt tax was an object with another. Thus then the measure might be considered as *the opening of a general assault upon the finances of the country.* It would be impossible for the Government to go on against such a system of attack. The financial system of this country was carried on,

he was willing to admit, *by artificial means.* The heavy expenditure of a country naturally increased the *burthens of the people.* The system could be *only kept together by sacrifices on the part of the people, energy on the part of the Government, and on the part of the House a firm and unanimous resolution to preserve the public credit.* With respect to the proposed measure for the Repeal of the Tax on Foreign Wool, he considered it at least a novel proceeding, and he did not think the present a time for discussion on the subject.—Honourable Gentlemen had said that Government showed no disposition to practise economy; to that charge he would say, that the estimates for the present year exhibited proofs of a reduction in the public expenditure unexampled at any former period, save periods when large armies had been reduced. The House were told that by repealing certain taxes, Ministers would be *driven to acts of economy*; he could assure Gentlemen that such steps were *unnecessary* (a laugh). The Ministers of the Crown were determined to adopt every possible plan of economy, and the Estimates for the next year would be as low as could possibly be consistent with the public security; further than *that Ministers would not go*; they would not be *forced* to propose Estimates which according to their ideas would be insufficient for the maintenance of the *public Establishments* and the *public security.* With respect to the tax in question, it should be recollected that the tax was but a very inconsiderable part of the expence attending the implements and machinery of the agriculturist. It was also worthy of consideration, that the expence of the farmer, as far as regarded the *maintenance of cattle*, had considerably decreased. He could not agree to the repeal of the tax; he lamented that the question had been discussed until the Report of the Agricultural Committee was laid on the Table of the House; for if that Committee should recommend the repeal of the tax, it was possible they might recommend an *increased taxation on something else.* The Right Honourable Gentleman next defended Ministers from the charge of not shewing a disposition to relieve the agriculturist. To effect that desirable object was not

within the controul of human policy. Ministers had, however, listened to every plan that had been suggested; they agreed to a Committee, which had been for some time carrying on its labours with unparalleled attention, and from them the country might expect all that could be expected from the most laborious inquiry, and the most praiseworthy solicitude, to remedy, as far as possible, the distresses of the times. *The support of the Financial System should be the first object of Parliament;* for if that system were once *successfully assailed*, all the interests of the country would be involved in distress and ruin. The distresses of 1816 were followed by comparative prosperity, but the improvement that took place could be only ascribed to the *stability of the public credit.* The Right Honourable Gentleman concluded by moving the previous question.

Mr. SCARLETT made some remarks, but not material in their amount.

Mr. HUSKISSON observed, that what his Right Honourable Friend (Mr. Vansittart) had said, was, that if Parliament should adopt all the suggestions that were thrown out by various Gentlemen, for the repeal of the salt tax, of the malt tax, of the husbandry horse tax, of the wool tax, or according to the Honourable Member for Abingdon, of the window tax—if all these taxes were repealed, those who looked at the *strength of our present financial system as the best safeguard of the country, could not continue to carry on the Government.* As to the particular tax, he should say, that if the repeal of this tax could be a substantial relief to agriculture, he should vote for the repeal, nay, he could go further, and say, that if it was even thought to be so by the agriculturists themselves, he should vote for it. But he could say, that in the Agricultural Committee it was not pretended by any one of the witnesses, that the repeal of it would be any material benefit, and out of 112 Petitions that had been presented to the House, the tax had only been mentioned in one—a Petition from the Hundred of Parkinhoe, in Leicestershire, the reasoning of which was very curious, as it stated that the framework knitters of Leicestershire were out of employ; therefore, said they, repeal the Tax upon

Husbandry Horses. In the year 1815 the Chancellor of the Exchequer reduced the Tax to 2s. 6d. on all farms under 200l. per annum. Now, would it be said that the pressure was less on those small farms, or that there was no agricultural pressure in Ireland, where no such tax existed? The argument of the Member for Wiltshire (Mr. Bennett) against the tax was contradictory. He argued that it would lower the price of corn, and that it would relieve the farmer from the pressure on him. Now, if it had one effect, it could not have the other. The fact was, this tax, like most others, was distributed *equally on the whole consumption of the country;* and he paid no more upon it than he did upon hemp or iron. The tax went to diminish the general profits, and abridge the general comforts of the community. But when gentlemen talked of the difference between *Romney Marsh and this or that description of land,* was it possible that any of those who had thought at all on the principles of political economy, or the application of capital, could be so ignorant of its first elements as to suppose that there would be a different return on account of this tax, and that one kind of cultivator would get ten, while another *would be content with five per cent?* A noble lord had read them a grave lesson from a King's Speech of 1721, recommending the taking off taxes on raw produce.—He (Mr. H.) had looked to the Statute book to see how that recommendation had been practically attended to. Acts had been passed to take off the tax from Beaver, Skins, Pepper, Cloves, Mace, Cinnamon, and Nutmegs, so that what the wise Whig Administration had in view to protect, was the culinary manufacture. In the next year too, a substitute for these taxes was imposed—a tax upon Papists. The Noble Lord (Lord Milton) had said, he saw no difference between buying up a quantity of corn or other commodities, with the superfluous taxation, and *reducing the debt with it.* Did the Noble Lord see no difference between a man buying up a quantity of commodities he had no need of, and *paying off a debt which he had contracted to pay at some time?* Was there not as a matter of policy and economy use in keeping up public

credit, unless we were never again to be in the situation of borrowers? As to his Hon. Friend behind him (Mr. W. Burrell) and others, he would ask, were they among those who voted for a large Sinking Fund? If they were, he called on them as men of *consistency* to vote against the repeal of this tax (loud cries of hear, hear!). —The substitute proposed by the Honourable Member for Cumberland, had been sufficiently disposed of. That Hon. Gentleman had always a substitute for every tax, in the prohibition of some foreign production; but he should recollect, that if by prohibition or over taxation, they drove away foreign commerce, they destroyed the foundation of their agriculture, and its support and hope under its present difficulties. He was willing to admit as fully as possible, the *mischiefs of the taxation brought upon us by an extended and expensive war*; taxation was only a choice of evils; it necessarily diminished the *comforts of the people*, and what was worse, checked the progress of that accumulation of profits which had been the source of the present greatness of the country [hear!]. But they were not to measure the pressure of taxation by the number of persons by whom a certain amount of taxes was paid, but by the amount of capital or income out of which it was paid. According to this calculation, many foreign countries were as heavily taxed as England, and he should say that Ireland was as heavily taxed as England, though in proportion to the population, it paid so little. *Our capital had grown, and was growing* in spite of our difficulties, so that he saw no reason to despond. After some further observations, the Right Honourable Gentleman concluded by voting for the previous question, which he said, was the proper course, as the motion was premature, the House not having heard what the Agricultural Committee recommended.

DIVISION.

141 for the Repeal; 118 against it.

MAJORITY.

Allen, J. H.	Acland, Sir T.
Ashurst, W. H.	Barham, J. F.
Astley, J. D.	Barham, J. F. Jun.

Barnard, Visct.	Harbord, Hon. E.
Becher, W. W.	Hobhouse, J. C.
Benyon, Benj.	Hartop, G.
Bernal, Ralph	Harvey, Sir E.
Brougham, Henry	Hotham, Lord
Rury, Visct.	James, W.
Byng, Geo.	Keck, G. A. L.
Burrell, W.	Kingsborough, Lord
Baillie, J.	Knatchbull, Sir Ed.
Bennett, John	Knox, Hon. T.
Bright, Henry	Lemon, Sir W.
Bastard, E. P.	Lennard, T. B.
Blackburne, John	Littleton, G.
Blair, J. H.	Lockhart, J. G.
Belgrave, Visct.	Lister, B. L.
Buxton, T. F.	Lawley, F.
Boughton, C. M.	Langston, J. H.
Calcraft, John	Lygon, Hon. H.
Carter, J.	Miles, Peter
Coffin, Sir I.	Maberly, John
Coke, T. W.	Maberly, W. L.
Colburn, N. R.	Macdonald, Jas.
Concannon, L.	Martin, John
Crompton, Sam.	Maxwell, J.
Creevey, Thos.	Milbank, M.
Calvert, N.	Milton, Visct.
Chaplin, C.	Monck, J. B.
Calthorpe, Hon. F.	Moore, Peter
laughton, T.	Manners, Lord C.
Cholmeley, Sir M.	Marjoribanks, S.
Chetwynd, G.	Newport, Rt. Hon.
Clive, Hon. R.	Sir J.
Cheere, E. M.	Newman, R. W.
Curteis, J. E.	Ord, W.
Corbett, Pantton	Ossulston, Lord
Cole, Sir C.	Phillips, G.
Clive, Lord	Powlett, Hon. W.
Cawthorne, J. F.	Price, R.
Cripps, Jos.	Portman, E. P.
Davies, T. H.	Powell, G. W.
Denman, T.	Paxton, W. G.
Denison, W. J.	Phillimore, Dr.
Duncannon, Visct.	Ricardo, David
Davenport, D.	Robarts, A.
Egerton, W.	Robarts, G.
Ellice, Ed.	Robinson, Sir G.
Fergusson, Sir R. C.	Rowley, Sir W.
Folkestone, Lord	Rumbold, C.
Forbes, C.	Rickford, W.
Fane, John	Russell, J. W.
Fellowes, W. H.	Rogers, Ed.
Gordon, R.	Smith, Hon. R.
Gratton, John	Smyth, J. H.
Graham, Sir J.	Scarlett, J.
Guise, Sir W.	Sefton, Earl of
Gooch, T. S.	Stanley, Lord
Gipps, G.	Sykes, D.
Hume, Jos.	Sebright, Sir J.
Haldimand, W.	Sumner, G. H.
Hamilton, Lord A.	

Sotheron, Frank Western, C. C.
 Tavi-stock, Marq. of Whitbread, —
 Taylor, C. Wilson, Sir R.
 Townshend, Lord C. Wood, M.
 Trench, F. Wodehouse, Ed.
 Williams, W. Wynn, Sir W. W.
 Warre, J. A. Wynn, C. W.
 Webb, L. Whitmore, W. W.

TELLERS—Sir C. Burrell and J. C. Curwen.

MINORITY.

A'Court, C. A. Canning, Rt. Hn. G.
 Arbuthnot, Hon. C. Collett, E. J.
 Apsley, Lord Cockburne, Sir G.
 Baring, H. Cust, Hon. P.
 Baring, A. Cooper, R. B.
 Brownlow, C. Courtenay, T. P.
 Beetive, Lord Courtenay, W.
 Beckett, Rt. Hn. J. Copley, Sir John S.
 Bathurst, Rt. Hn. B. Dalrymple, A. J.
 Binning, Lord Drummond, Home
 Brydges, Ald. Davis, Hart
 Bourne, Rt. Hon. S. Doveton, G.
 Buchannan, John Divett, T.
 Brogden, J. Dowdeswell, J. E.
 Bradshaw, R. H. Dundas, Rt. Hn. W.
 Barry, Rt. Hn. J. M. Douglas, R. K.
 Brecknock, Lord Evans, W.
 Burgh, Sir U. Elliot, Hon. W.
 Bankes, H. Forrester, C. W.
 Blair, J. Fleming, J.
 Calvert, John. Fane, V.
 Clive, Henry Fane, T.
 Cust, Hon. W. Ford, M.
 Croker, J. W. Grant, Rt. Hon. C.
 Clerk, Sir G. Gordon, Hon. W.

Gladstone, J. Pole, Rt. Hn. W. W.
 Gascoigne, Gen. Pennant, G. H. D.
 Grenfell, Pascoe Palmerstone, Visct.
 Gifford, Sir R. Pearce, J.
 Gossett, R. Roberts, G.
 Holmes, W. Robinson, Rt. Hn. E.
 Holford, J. Robertson, A.
 Harding, Sir H. Rice, Hon. G. R.
 Hill, Sir G. Smith, Sam.
 Hodson, J. Smith, Abel
 Huskisson, Rt. Hon. Seymour, H.
 W. Scott, Hon. W.
 Irving, John Stewart, R.
 Lowther, Lord Scott, S. C.
 Lowther, Hon. H. Somerset, Lord G.
 Lowther, John Sotheron, F.
 Lewis, W. Sheldon R.
 Long, Rt. Hon. Sir Stopford, Lord
 C. Smith, C.
 Lovaine, Lord Tremayne, J. H.
 Mansfield, J. Tulk, C.
 Musgrave, Sir P. Twiss, Horace
 Macdonald, Ronald Taylor, Sir H.
 Martin, Sir B. Townshend, Hon. H.
 Martin, B. Vansittart, Rt. Hon.
 Marryatt, Jos. N.
 Macnaghton, E. A. Wyndham, W.
 Mitchell, John Wetherell, C.
 Munday, Capt. Wilmot, R.
 Ommannay, Sir F. Wilbraham, E. B.
 Price, Richard Warren, C.
 Pechell, Sir T. B. Ward, R.
 Pitt, W. M. Yarmouth, Ead of
 Phipps, Hon. Gen.

TELLERS.—H. Goulburn and S. R. Lushington.

"ENGLAND'S GLORY."

In my last I intimated my intention to make some remarks on the dispute between this hero and Mr. CANNING; in consequence of which an *anonymous letter* (all in character) has been sent me by one who calls himself "*an Elector of Westminster*" and a *Tradesman*, threatening to *thrash* me with an *Oak-Stick*, if I put my *announced intention into execution!* This, I suppose, proceeds from that innate attachment to "*the liberty of the press*," which is a standing toast at the annual festivals, held to perpetuate the renown of "*Westminster's Pride and England's Glory*." The writer of this anonymous effusion of folly and poltroonry is *no tradesman!* The *tradesmen* of Westminster are, I imagine, any thing but full of *admiration* of their *cock*; and this, I think, we shall see proved, if he have the courage to face another contest for this great and really public-spirited City. The letter is at the Office of the Register, to be seen by any one; and, some one, perhaps, may know the *author* and writing.—This letter has had one good effect: it has convinced me, that the subject is of more im-

portance than even I thought it; and will induce me to go more fully into the matter than I intended.—I shall put this off for a week, as a *punishment* to the writer, or, perhaps, the dictator, of this anonymous letter; for, if his arm was great enough to induce him to take so desperate a step as this, what will he not suffer during the ensuing week?

AGRICULTURAL REPORT.

This *Report* is made, and will be printed, together with the *Evidence*, in a few days. It is my intention to *re-publish it entire*, in an Octavo Volume, *same form as the Register*, and at as low a price as possible. The subject is of the very greatest importance; and the book will be a thing to be appealed to for ages. It will be found full of most curious and deeply interesting matter. In order to render it *convenient*, I shall Number the divisions of the matter, and, then, in a Register or two, to contain **NOTES** and **COMMENTS** on several parts of the book, I shall *refer to these Numbers*; and thus make the thing complete.

MR. BIRKBECK.

There appeared in the *MORNING CHRONICLE*, Wednesday, a thing purporting to be an extract of a letter from this gentleman to "*a friend in York-shire*," which contains a very unprovoked attack upon me, in consequence of my letters, which form part of the *Year's Residence in America*. Mr. BIRKBECK shall have an answer in my next. In the meanwhile, the public should bear in mind, that my letters to him were *published in America* ! In fact, those letters have saved *thousands of worthy families from ruin* ; but, then, they have marred Mr. Birkbeck's speculations ; for to no other cause can I ascribe so unmannerly and foul an assault from a person to whom, or of whom, I never wrote or spoke but in terms of kindness and respect.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A. B. will very much oblige me by sending the *Pamphlets*, and

by saying *when*, if at all, he wishes to have them back. I can assure him, that I never saw any work on the subject of, or near to, the date that he speaks of.

P., who thinks he has discovered a *grammatical error* in the Register, will, I think, find that he has not, if he look at my grammar, paragraphs 200 and 201. However, I *can see*, when I happen to read a Register in *print* (which I seldom do) *grammatical errors enough* ; and, when it is considered, that the whole pamphlet is begun to be written and printed off in about 60 *hours*, the wonder naturally is, that there are not ten errors where there is one. I now and then see sentences made quite nonsense by mistake of the printer. But I do not expect miracles to be performed for me. If the bomb-shell produce the desired *effect* its shape is not of much importance. Where, indeed, there is *time for revision*, grammatical errors would be a mark of *laziness* in me, and that is a sin, which, of all others, I

should dislike to be justly accused of.

COBBETT'S SERMONS.

Sermons the public call them, and I will do the same. The *Six Acts* provides for the free circulation of pamphlets on religion, so that I may be said to take, in this case, the benefit of those acts. I will confess, that it was those Acts which *inspired* me with the thought of preaching in print. "*Tract*" is beneath the thing described; and, besides, the public *will have* mine to be *Sermons*. Sermons, therefore, they shall be. As a proof of the piety of the days, in which we live, and of my superiority over the *Doctors*, I will venture to say, that I am able to prove a ten times greater sale of my Sermons, than can be proved of the Sermons of any Doctor that belongs, or ever did belong, to either of the Universities.

PRELIMINARY PART

OF

COBBETT'S PAPER AGAINST GOLD.

This Work is just published, price 3s. 6d. and it does, I think, clearly prove the *justice* as well as the *necessity* of greatly reducing first, and, in the end, stopping altogether, the *Interest of the Debt*. It consists of Essays written between 1803 and 1806, both inclusive, to which are subjoined, some notes. Its arguments then were met by arguments (which are all fairly stated) and by most foul abuse. They remained wholly unshaken then; and, I am satisfied, they will remain unshaken now.—The reader will be amused to see, that Mr. RICARDO'S project for *dividing the land with the fund-holders*, originated with one of the silliest of my antagonists of 1806! Oh! Mr. Peel! How "*happy* the Spanish Legislator must be to be

"able to take down from his
"shelf a Blackstone, or a Ri-
"cardo!"

July 2nd will be published, the First
Part (price 1s.) of

**THE COMMENTARIES ON
THE LAWS OF ENGLAND.** The
By Sir WILLIAM BLACKSTONE. The

Sixteenth Edition. With the last Cor-
rections of the Author; and the Pas-
sages on the Liberty of the Subject,
which appear only in the first edition.
With Annotations and Comments, as
also Corrections of the Errors and
Mis-statements of the Learned Judge,
respecting Constitutional Law and Le-
gal Antiquities. By JOHN WILLIAMS,
Esq.

Printed for S. Sweet, Law Book-
seller, Chancery-lane; and to be com-
pleted in 40 Parts, (forming 4 hand-
some volumes, 8vo.) published weekly.